



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE *VIE DE MARIANNE* AND THEIR RELATION TO CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH FICTION

The eighteenth-century vogue of Marivaux in England has been discussed by both French and English critics chiefly from the viewpoint of his possible influence upon Richardson. That this problem is one of continued vitality recent studies have made evident.¹ As a contribution to this question as well as to the wider problem of the relation of contemporary translations of *Marianne* to English fiction in general, I wish to make clear the following points:

1. Statements about the translations of *Marianne* have frequently been inaccurate and incomplete.
2. Instead of the one translation usually assumed to be the source of the vogue of Marivaux in English, there is evidence that by 1746 three translations were in circulation.
3. Circumstances connected with the publication of the two additional versions throw light upon the popularity of Marivaux; the nature of the translations makes clear the ground of their appeal, and the relation of Marivaux and Richardson to fictional development before and during the period in which *Pamela* appeared.

I

The *Vie de Marianne* was first published in parts, as follows: 1731, Part 1; 1734, Part 2; 1735, Part 3; 1736, Parts 4, 5, 6; 1737, Parts 7, 8; 1741, Parts 9, 10, 11. In 1742 the eleven parts were published together in Paris. In 1745 an edition was published in Amsterdam containing the original eleven parts and a spurious

¹ Though Mr. Cazamian in 1913 in his chapter on Richardson in the *Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.* assumed that Austin Dobson in 1902 had definitely settled the question in the negative (*Samuel Richardson*, "English Men of Letters" [London, 1902], pp. 48-50), yet in the year before Mr. Cazamian's chapter was published the controversy was reviewed by Mr. E. C. Baldwin in a study of "Marivaux's Place in Character Portrayal," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXVII (1912), 184-85; in 1913 it was again discussed by Mr. G. C. Macaulay in an article on "Richardson and His Predecessors," in the *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, VIII (1913), 463 ff.; and within the last year the question has been reopened by Miss Carola Schröers in her article, "Ist Richardsons *Pamela* von Marivauxs *Vie de Marianne* beeinflusst?" in *Englische Studien*, XLIX (1916), 220-54.

conclusion in the form of a twelfth part. These twelve parts were published together in Paris in 1755.¹

An English translation came out under a title literally derived from the French:

The Life of Marianne, or the Adventures of the Countess of . . . By M. de Marivaux. Translated from the French Original.

According to contemporary notices in periodicals, quoted by Mr. Esdaile, this translation appeared in parts in June, 1736, January, 1737, April, 1742.² The *London Magazine* for April, 1742, in announcing Vol. II refers to it as "Printed for C. Davis."³ I have been unable to find a copy of this work, which Clara Reeve seems to have described in 1785 as a "poor literal translation."⁴

To clear up the confusion that has existed, I wish to call attention at this point to the inaccuracy with which this and other translations have been cited, in discussions of Marivaux and of his relation to Richardson. The appearance of the story in parts has at times been ignored. Thus Miss Thomson in her usually accurate study says, "An English translation of Marianne appeared in 1736."⁵ Mr. Macaulay fails to indicate that a second volume of this translation appearing in 1737 was also available to Richardson. He says:

It is clear that for his acquaintance with French romance he [Richardson] must have depended on translations. This, however, does not cause any real difficulty. An English translation of *La Vie de Marianne*, so far as it had then proceeded, was published in 1736, four years before the publication of *Pamela*.⁶

Professor Raleigh writes, with inaccuracy at more than one point:

It was not until . . . years after Marivaux by his *Vie de Marianne* (1731) had singularly anticipated Richardson in subject and treatment, although, so far as can be ascertained, without influencing him, that the English *Pamela* was born in 1740. . . . It seems likely that Richardson

¹ Larroumet, *Marivaux, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1882), pp. 607-8. There is some disagreement as to the date of the appearance of the eleventh part. Lanson, *Man. Bibl. de la litt. fran. mod.* (Paris, 1911), III, 696, and Petit de Julleville, *Hist. de la litt. et de la lang. fran.* (Paris), VI, 465, give 1742 as the date.

² *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740* (London, 1912), p. 369. The same data are given by A. Dobson, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

³ *Lond. Mag.*, XX (1742), 208.

⁴ *Progress of Romance* (London, 1785), p. 129.

⁵ Samuel Richardson, *A Biographical and Critical Study* (London, 1900), p. 148.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 467.

had read *The Life of Marianne* with the continuation of Mme Riccoboni, which appeared in three volumes, 12mo, in 1736.¹

Dunlop² and Max Gassmeyer³ refer only to a translation of 1784, which I shall consider later. Mr. Boas refers only to a translation of 1743.⁴ Whether this is an inaccurate citation of the 1736-42 translation or a reference to another is a question; I suspect the former is the case.

We may note here that of this literal translation Richardson, before writing *Pamela*, probably could have read only the first six parts, which appeared by January, 1737. This carried the story to the scene at the minister's house, where Marianne is rescued from a marriage, plotted by Valville's relatives, by the sudden appearance of Valville and Mme Miran. This fact is not sufficiently recognized in Miss Schröers' study. In her interesting array of parallel passages in *Pamela* and *Marianne*, she finds most of her material in Parts I-III of *Marianne*, the attempted seduction of Marianne by M. Climal being comparable to the persecution of Pamela by Mr. B. Admitting the similarities in these passages, and their possible significance, one recognizes at the same time that many of the details are implicit in the situation. It should be noted also that two of Miss Schröers' parallels⁵ are drawn from the seventh part of *Marianne*, which Richardson probably could not have read in translation before 1740.

II

The popularity of *Marianne* in the early years of Richardson's literary activity is attested not by one but by three translated versions: one of them the literal translation already discussed; the

¹ *English Novel* (New York, 1911), p. 140. In regard to the date of Mme Riccoboni's translation see *infra*, p. 114.

² *Hist. of Fiction* (London, 1911), II, 462.

³ *Richardsons "Pamela" und seine Quellen* (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 19 ff.; quoted by Miss Schröers.

⁴ "Richardson's Novels and Their Influence," in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* (Oxford, 1911), II; quoted by Miss Schröers.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 251. M. Larroumet describes the first edition (1737) of the seventh part as follows: "144 p., y compris le titre et l'approbation de Saurin, du 27 janvier 1737, au bas de la page 144" (*op. cit.*, p. 608). This probably, though not surely, did not appear in the second volume of the translation advertised in the periodicals of January, 1737, but did appear in the third volume in 1742. Note, too, that Miss Schröers seems to have confused with Richardson's own continuation of *Pamela* the spurious continuation brought out by Ward and Chandler, likewise in 1741, under the title *Pamela in High Life*, probably written by John Kelly. See Dobson, *op. cit.*, pp. 54 ff.

others, two versions, slightly varied, of a translation furnished with moralistic interpolations of a Richardsonian sort, and a moralistic conclusion unnoticed, so far as I know, in discussions dealing with the two well-known attempts to continue Marivaux's story in French.

The first reference I find to this second translation is on the title-page of another novel translated from the French:

Memoirs of the Countess de Bressol . . . Done from the French by the Translator of the Virtuous Orphan: Or, the Life of Marianne. London, Jacob Robinson, 1743. 2 vols. 12mo.

This translation of *Marianne* I have found in the 1784 edition (which Dunlop probably had in mind) in Harrison's "Novelists' Magazine," with the following title-page:

The Virtuous Orphan; Or, the Life of Marianne, Countess of * * * . Translated from the French of Marivaux. In four volumes [in one]. London: Printed for Harrison and Co. No. 18, Paternoster Row. MDCCLXXXIV.

The volume is octavo, with 313 pages, double column. This work, which contains a long Translator's Preface, is not merely a translation with such liberties as eighteenth-century translators allowed themselves frequently; it is a translation, literal in the main, but modified to moralistic ends by means of omissions, interpolations, and a conclusion.

In 1746 appeared an altered version of this translation, possibly pirated, in one volume, small octavo, pages viii+453:

The Life and Adventures of Indiana, the Virtuous Orphan. Illustrated with Copper-Plates. London: Printed for C. Whitefield, in White-Fryers, Fleet-Street. MDCCXLVI.

For the most part, this work is identical with that reprinted by Harrison in 1784. There is, however, no translator's preface, and the title-page gives no indication that the work is a translation. Other differences are in the names of the characters: Marianne becomes Indiana, Valville becomes Valentine, M. Climal becomes Mr. Chambers, and other characters, similarly, are given English names beginning usually with the same initial letter as the French ones. More significant is the fact that this version is considerably shorter than the 1784 version; the nature of the differences will be discussed later. It is possible that at its first appearance the version

of *The Virtuous Orphan; Or, the Life of Marianne* was comparable in length to *Indiana*; while the 1784 octavo edition of four volumes in one may represent later revision and elaboration of an original version common to both. On the other hand, *Indiana* may represent a piratical abridgment of an original identical with the 1784 edition.

In 1747 appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* the notice of a second edition of *The Virtuous Orphan*. The title and the format of this edition are complicating factors. The publisher is the same as for the *Memoirs of the Countess de Bressol*, in which appeared in 1743 the reference already quoted to the *Virtuous Orphan; Or, the Life of Marianne*; the format is also the same as that of the *Memoirs*. The notice reads:

The Virtuous Orphan. Edit. 2. Robinson, in two volumes, 12mo. 6s.¹

This may well be a second edition of the translation referred to in 1743, and both may have been published by Robinson, who may have brought out his second edition in 1747 to offset Whitefield's altered version of 1746, published piratically or otherwise. Whether the first edition appeared in 1743 or earlier, whether it could in any way, in print or manuscript, have influenced the author of *Pamela*, I have no way of knowing. It is conceivable, but less probable, I think, that this is a second edition of *Indiana*.

To *Indiana* I find two other references. Mr. J. M. Clapp quotes for me the following entry in Dobell's Catalogue 199 to an edition of 1755:

The Life and Misfortunes and Adventures of Indiana, the Virtuous Orphan; written by herself. 12mo.

Clara Reeve, after referring to the "poor literal translation," writes:

Soon after another attempt was made by a still worse hand, this is called *Indiana or the Virtuous Orphan*, in this piece of patch work, many of the fine reflexions, the most valuable part of the work, are omitted, the story left unfinished by the death of M. Marivaux, is finished by the same bungler, and in the most absurd manner. It puts me in mind of what was said of a certain translator of Virgil:

Read the commandments, friend,—translate no further,
For it is written, thou shalt do no murder.²

¹ *Gent. Mag.*, XVII (1747), 156; see also *Scots Mag.*, IX (1747), 147.

² *Progress of Romance*, pp. 129–30.

The Virtuous Orphan is referred to, also, in two reviews of a later work, soon to be quoted. Both *The Virtuous Orphan* and *Indiana* are listed in Bent's General Catalogues. In the edition of 1779 appear the following entries:

Marianne, or Virtuous Orphan, 2 Vols. 12mo 0 6 0.¹

Virtuous Orphan, or Life of Indiana, 2 Vols. 12mo 0 6 0.²

This refers, of course, to an edition before that of 1784 in the "Novelists' Magazine." In the edition of 1786 the following entries appear:

Marianne, or Virtuous Orphan, 3 Vols. 12mo 0 9 0.³

Virtuous Orphan, or Life of Indiana, 2 Vols. 12mo 0 6 0.⁴

The change here indicated in *Marianne; Or, the Virtuous Orphan* between 1779 and 1786 from two duodecimo volumes at six shillings to three duodecimo volumes at nine shillings may possibly result from typographical errors, or may result from additions to the work within those years; possibly these additions may appear in the 1784 edition before me (in 313 double-column pages octavo, four volumes bound in one). This is of a length which it would seem difficult to have compressed into either two or three duodecimo volumes, though it might possibly have been included in three.⁵

Another interesting difference between the two translated versions is in the matter of Marivaux's intercalated story *l'Histoire de la religieuse*. This story does not appear at all in *Indiana*; instead, the translator's conclusion follows immediately after the translation of the eighth part of Marivaux's story, the point at which the French author drops the story of Marianne. In the *Virtuous Orphan*;

¹ *A General Catalogue of Books in All Languages, Arts, and Sciences, Printed in Great Britain, and Published in London, from the Year MDCC to the Present Time. Classed under Several Heads of Literature, and Alphabetically Disposed under Each Head, with Their Sizes and Prices* (London, 1779), p. 69.

² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

³ *A General Catalogue of Books . . . from the Year MDCC to MDCCLXXXVI* . . . (London, 1786), p. 74.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁵ A rough estimate shows that the *Vie de Marianne*, in twelve parts in French, contains about 220,000 words; *Indiana* about 150,000 words; *Marianne* (in English) about 263,000 words; the *Memoirs of the Countess de Bressol*, in two volumes duodecimo, about 154,000 words. The difference in length between *Indiana* and *Marianne* appears less in the conclusion than in the translated portions; the conclusion contains about 48,000 words in the former, and about 57,000 words in the latter. The inequality may be partly explained by the fact that in *Marianne* the division into twelve books as in the French original is retained, and by the practice of beginning and concluding each book with a paragraph or more of informal comment addressed by the narrator to her friend. These divisions and comments are omitted in *Indiana*.

Or, the *Life of Marianne*, on the other hand, the nun's story is introduced, but not in its proper place at the end of the eighth book. In this version the conclusion begins at the same point as in *Indiana*, and runs through the ninth book and most of the tenth; then, toward the end of the tenth book (p. 226), "The Life of Miss de Terviere" (*de Tervire*, Marivaux spells it) is introduced, and continues through the eleventh book; at the beginning of the twelfth book (p. 275) the conclusion is resumed where it was dropped (on p. 226).

A hypothesis as to the date of the translation may be hazarded from the misplacement of this story. Possibly the first eight parts were translated, and the conclusion appended, before the last three instalments of Marivaux's work (Parts 9, 10, 11, Paris, 1741) appeared; then at some later date, when the whole work was well known and in its final state, the intercalated story was translated and introduced into the earlier translated version, at a point in the conclusion where it could be made to fit. The nun and her story are again referred to in this version at the very end. Should this hypothesis be the true explanation, the original version of the translation may well have appeared before *Pamela*, since the first eight parts were accessible to the translator by the end of the year 1737, and since nothing more appeared until 1741, when *l'Histoire de la religieuse* began in the ninth part. This explanation is by no means the only one possible, however; the nun's story may have been inserted as late as 1784, or, again, it may have been introduced in the original version, which needs only to have appeared by 1743.

Other differences between *Indiana* and *Marianne* appear in slight variations in phrasing, the changes in the latter suggesting a later attempt to revise and polish an earlier draught. How late these changes were made I have no way of determining.

The authorship of these translations I identify by means of the two book notices already referred to. In 1767 there was translated into English a continuation of the *Vie de Marianne* by Mme Riccoboni—*la suite* to which Fleury refers.¹ The legend is that in response to a challenge from Saint-Foix, author of *Essais sur Paris*, Mme Riccoboni undertook to prove that Marivaux's style in *Marianne* was susceptible of imitation. She made what was called at the time

¹ *Marivaux et le marivaudage* (Paris, 1881), pp. 192 ff.

une suite à ce roman. This appeared in part in a collection entitled *le Monde comme il est*, by the author of the *Nouveau Spectateur*, 4 vols., 1760–61, edited by Bastid; the second part appeared in Mme Riccoboni's works. The whole was composed ten years before its first publication, or about 1751, according to Mme Riccoboni's own statement.¹

M. Fleury pointed out in 1881 that critics down to Edouard Fournier in his 1877 edition of *Marianne* have confused the anonymous twelfth part (*le fin*) of the 1745 edition with this *suite* by Mme Riccoboni. M. Fleury published them both in the appendix to his volume and pointed out the radical difference in content and style between the two. He attributed the *fin* of the twelfth part to some writer of the sixth order who had been hired by a Dutch bookseller to increase the price of the edition by giving an end to the story. "Ces supercheries étaient fréquentes au dix-huitième siècle," he says. Such a *supercherie* the English conclusion also appears to be, and the motive that inspired it may have been similarly commercial.

Announcing the translation of Mme Riccoboni's work, there appeared in 1768 in the *Monthly Review* the following notice:

The continuation of the Life of Marianne. To which is added the History of Ernestina; with letters and other Miscellaneous Pieces. Translated from the French of Mme Riccoboni, 12mo., 3s. Becket and de Hondt.

This is not the first attempt that has been made to carry on the unfinished *Life of Marianne*, written by the celebrated Marivaux; but it is a less successful one than that of an English writer; [Note: "Mr. Joseph Collyer, author of *Letters from Felicia to Charlotte*; and translator of the *Death of Abel*."] who, about twenty years ago, translated Marivaux's work, and also brought the story to a conclusion; under the title of *The Virtuous Orphan*. There was likewise another translation made about the same time; entitled *The Life of Marianne; or the Adventures of the Countess of . . .*; but in this version the story remains in the same unfinished state in which the French Author left the original.—As to Mme Riccoboni's continuation, it still leaves the tale incomplete, and is not the best of her performances.²

In 1767 in the *Gentleman's Magazine* had appeared the following confused notice:

¹ *Marivaux et le marivaudage* (Paris, 1881), p. 195; see also Dunlop, *op. cit.*, pp. 465–66.

² *Monthly Rev.*, XXXVIII (1768), 72.

The first part of the life of *Marianne* was published some years ago, under the title of *La Paissanne Parvenu*¹ and was translated into *English* under the title of *The Virtuous Orphan*, by the author of *Some Letters from Felicia to Charlotte*, who also concluded the story. The events related by the English translator are very different from those in this continuation, in which the story is not concluded.²

The author of *Letters from Felicia to Charlotte* and the translator of the *Death of Abel* was probably not Mr. Joseph Collyer, but his wife Mary Collyer, who was also, I think, the translator of the *Memoirs of the Countess de Bressol*,³ a translation which I suspect of having likewise been fitted with a conclusion foreign to the French original.

Mrs. Collyer's variations upon Marivaux's theme are worthy of note primarily for the light they throw upon the highly romantic taste of her day and upon its readiness to make use of the novel as a vehicle of didactic purpose. Her work here and elsewhere makes Richardson seem less extraordinary than does the frequent juxtaposition of his work with that of his great rival, Fielding. Mrs. Collyer's moralizing of the theme shows, too, how easily the heavy didacticism of a Richardsonian type could be engrafted upon the Gallic psychology of Marivaux.⁴

Perhaps the most interesting interpolation in the translated part of the story occurs in the description of the person and home of the good clergyman and his sister who adopt Marianne. I will quote the accounts as given in the French original, in the English *Indiana*, and in the English *Marianne*, to illustrate *in an extreme case* the method of the translator. Marivaux had written of his two minor characters:

¹ This title marks a confusion not uncommon, according to Clara Reeve (*op. cit.*, 130), between Marivaux's other novel, *le Paysan Parvenu*, and a novel by the Chevalier de Mouhy entitled *la Paysanne Parvenue*, translated by Mrs. Haywood under the title of *the Virtuous Villager* (see Whicher, *The Life and Works of Eliza Haywood* [New York, 1915], p. 152).

² *Gent. Mag.* (1767), p. 80.

³ *Letters from Felicia to Charlotte* and its author I have discussed in "An Early Romantic Novel," in *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, XV (1916), 564-98. Further facts about Mrs. Collyer and her work I hope to present soon in my forthcoming dissertation.

⁴ Mr. Macaulay, though somewhat committed to the theory of Richardson's indebtedness to Marivaux, remarks, "It is needless to say, moreover, that the rather heavy morality of Richardson has no counterpart in Marivaux's work," *op. cit.*, p. 464.

Le Curé, qui quoique Curé de Village, avoit beaucoup d'esprit, et qui étoit un homme de très-bonne famille . . . ; j'aurois été fort à plaindre, sans la tendresse que le Curé et sa sœur prirent pour moi.

Cette sœur m'éleva comme si j'avois été son enfant. Je vous ai déjà dit que son frère et elle étoient de très-bonne famille; on disoit qu'ils avoient perdu leur bien par un procès, et que lui il étoit venu se réfugier dans cette Cure où elle l'avoit suivi, car ils s'aimoient beaucoup.

Ordinairement, qui dit nièce ou sœur de Curé de Village, dit quelque chose de bien grossier, et d'approchant d'une paysanne. Mais cette fille-ci n'étoit pas de même, c'étoit une personne pleine de raison et de politesse, qui joignoit à cela beaucoup de vertu. . . .

. . . Je passai tout le temps de mon éducation dans mon bas âge, pendant lequel j'appris à faire je ne sais combien de petites nippes de femme; industrie qui m'a bien servie dans la suite.¹

In *Indiana* appears the following passage amplifying this:

Mr. Robinson, for that was the name of my benefactor, was a gentleman of a good family, and formerly enjoyed an estate which was exhausted by a tedious law-suit: However his living brought him in a handsome subsistence, and he knew how to be contented without enjoying many of the superfluities of life. (a) His generosity and the agreeable gaiety of his temper, in spite of his age, in which he was pretty far advanced, made him beloved by all who knew him; and he knew how to keep up the two characters of the accomplished gentleman and the judicious divine. Mrs. Robinson, his sister, (b) was a lady of good sense, free from affectation, and though an old maid, had such a sweet disposition, such true politeness, and undissembled goodness, as abundantly recompensed the loss of those charms, which had been destroyed by the smallpox, she being extremely scared (c) by it.

There are the persons to whom I owe my education, and that virtue which has supported me under all my afflictions, and has raised me from the lowest and most miserable condition to my present station. We lived in the greatest harmony. Their affection for me knew no bounds, and I in turn, honoured and loved them as my parents. The house that we lived in was an ancient building, (d) and had for some ages past belonged to the vicars of the place; the rooms were large, (e) but the ceilings low. We had behind the house a pretty commodious garden (f) which seemed rather the product of nature than of art; there was fruit in abundance of almost (g) every kind, which grew promiscuously among the other trees that never bore any, so that they altogether formed a thick and shady grove, (h) for it was a maxim with Mr. Robinson, that nothing but what is natural can be pleasing to the subjects of nature, nor can art any further delight than as it resembles it. (i)

¹ *La Vie de Marianne, ou les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse de . . . , par Monsieur de Marivaux* (London, 1778), I, 10-12.

Opposite the middle door of the house was a long shady walk which extended itself to the bottom of a piece of pasture ground behind the garden, and at the foot of several of the trees were raised seats of earth covered with camomile. When fatigued with severe study, Mr. Robinson took delight with working here, and acting the part of a laborious gardner; an employment he chose to preserve his health and recreate his mind. He committed the management of his kitchen garden and vineyard to a poor laborer in the neighborhood, whom he had released from prison, by paying a debt for him, and who besides he rewarded for his labour.

This good man began every day with paying (*j*) his duty to God in prayer; after breakfast the sister and I worked with our needles, played upon a harpsicord, (*k*) or amused ourselves with reading; and in the afternoon we walked in the garden to see Mr. Robinson work, and be entertained with his conversation, and in the evening he (*l*) acted the part of an arbitrator of the differences of his quarrelsome neighbors, which he was frequently so happy as to adjust to the satisfaction of all parties concerned; and after supper concluded the day with prayer as he began it.

This worthy gentleman began early to show his zeal for my happiness, by establishing in my mind the nicest sentiments of virtue and honour. He represented religion in a light that made it appear all amiable and lovely, and as the highest happiness of a rational being: He painted the substantial pleasures of conscious innocence, the exquisit happiness of the mind that can survey itself with tranquillity and self-approbation, in such pleasing colours, as perfectly charmed me. (*m*)

Mrs. Robinson was not behind hand with her brother in her care of my education. She taught me everything necessary for a young woman to learn. . . . A country vicar's niece or sister is commonly an awkward, untoward, unbred, country-like woman; but Mrs. Robinson was perfectly the reverse; she was polite and virtuous; her behaviour was free and easy; in short, she had good sense, good breeding, and abundance of virtue.¹

The thread of the narrative is then resumed in a literal translation.

The *Virtuous Orphan* differs from *Indiana*, at the points marked in the foregoing quotations, as follows:

(a) Inserted: "Pride and ostentation he was utter stranger to."

(b) Omitted: "his sister."

(c) "Seamed" for "scared" (i.e., scarred).

(d) Altered: "one of the most antique buildings I ever saw."

(e) Altered: "the rooms were spacious and numerous."

(f) Inserted: "a beautiful sylvan scene."

(g) Inserted: "almost."

(h) A long insertion appears here: "The vine supported his feeble branches by encircling the oak, and the flowers seemed scattered with a

¹ *Indiana*, pp. 7-9.

careless hand over the verdant turf; those whose tender stalks were liable to be broke down by unfriendly feet, creeped in clusters round the trunks of the trees; while the woodbine and jessamine were made to rise above, and twine amongst the branches; there the trees were never pruned but in order to make them fruitful, or to let in the prospect of the fine meadows, or the far distant hills; which, seeming to mingle with the clouds, formed a delightful horizon. We had no answering platforms, no cut-walks, nor anything like that studied affectation of regularity which disgusts the eye by a repetition of uniformity, and a constant sameness of design."¹

(i) Another insertion of similar import: "The agreeable intermixture of opening and shade was contrived with such exquisit art, as not only to appear natural, but to let in or exclude the prospect of the adjacent country to the advantage of the whole scene."²

(j) Altered: "paying a grateful homage to the supreme being."

(k) Altered: "spinet" for "harpsicord."

(l) Inserted: "this pattern of benevolence" for "he."

(m) Here is a continuation, over a column in length, of the clergyman's religious exhortations, in the same vein as what precedes.

In this version the clergyman and his sister, unnamed by Marivaux, named Mr. and Mrs. Robinson in *Indiana*, are called Mr. and Mrs. De Rosard.

This passage illustrates, as I have said, in an extreme way, the alteration of Marivaux's original in the Collyer translation, and the variations resulting either from elaboration or abridgment between the two English versions. The details belonging to an essentially English vicarage inserted into the French context are as amusingly incongruous as much of the solid Anglo-Saxon moralizing and the artless conclusion. The discussion of gardening, and the preference for nature over art, are quite in keeping with other utterances of Mrs. Collyer in *Letters from Felicia to Charlotte* (1744-49). Aside from the interpolations, the translation follows with fair accuracy the original, many more omissions occurring, of course, in *Indiana* than in the longer version.

In speaking of the two French attempts to carry on Marivaux's story, M. Fleury praises Mme Riccoboni's continuation because she appears "fidèle au procédé constant de Marivaux de placer le drame dans le cœur humain et de ne faire intervenir les causes extérieures que pour créer les situations et jamais pour les dénouer."³

¹ *The Virtuous Orphan* (London, 1784), p. 10.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 199.

On the other hand, he condemns the French conclusion, which was published in 1745 as the *douzième partie*, because the anonymous author "a recouru pour ramener Valville à Marianne à des causes extrinsèques que non seulement Marivaux n'aurait pas avouées, mais qui l'auraient profondément choqué."¹

Mrs. Collyer's conclusion is subject to much the same criticism as is the *douzième partie* of the French edition. External events, for the most part, are responsible for the reconciliation and happy dénouement.

Through an accident the mother of the hero [Mme Miran in Marivaux's original, Mrs. de Valville in the English *Marianne*, Mrs. Valentine in *Indiana*] gets possession of a letter to her son explaining that the commission he was seeking was lost through deliberate negligence on his part, negligence due to his affair with Miss Varthon [Miss Wharton in *Indiana*]. The mother's affection for the heroine is increased by this evidence of her son's unworthiness. Her anxiety, however, seriously affects her health. The heroine tells of the Officer's proposal, and together they decide that she cannot accept it. The mother becomes dangerously ill, and the heroine goes with her to her country place. Valville [Valentine] hearing of his mother's illness, arrives unexpectedly. Marianne [Indiana] faints, and the prodigal hero's love returns to her on the instant, just as it had left her previously on the occasion of Miss Varthon's [Miss Wharton's] fainting. The heroine's recovery from the resulting illness is hastened by a complete reconciliation. The mother dies, and the heroine returns to a convent for a proper period of mourning. Knowing that the girl has inherited a fortune from her friend, a mercenary abbess plots to separate her from those interested in her and to persuade her to take the veil. This plot frustrated, the heroine goes to stay with Mrs. Dorsin [Mrs. Dawson] until her marriage to the hero. While she is there the discovery of her parentage is made; the devoted officer proves to be her uncle, and she the heiress to a title and a fortune. Behaving with marked generosity to her new-found family, she accepts only a portion of her estate, is presented at court, is married, and when last heard of is devoting herself to the education of a growing family in the love of virtue and noble sentiments.

Obviously the intercepted letter, the fatal illness of the mother, the heroine's fainting, the final identification of her parentage, all these items fall under condemnation as *causes extérieures*. The material is of distinct interest to students of English literature,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 200. M. Fleury summarizes the conclusion in the *douzième partie*, and Mme Riccoboni's continuation, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-98; the latter he also reprints in full in an appendix, pp. 372-408.

however, for the romantic quality of the feeling, philosophy, and incident introduced.

III

As illustrative of a typically British attitude toward Marivaux's novel, and of the sort of interpretation it received in translated form, I wish to quote a few passages from the Translator's Preface to the 1784 edition of *The Virtuous Orphan; Or, the Life of Marianne*, an interesting critical document to be compared, as evidence of general tendencies of the period, with the prefaces to Richardson's works. I cannot tell whether this preface appeared in earlier editions of the translation or whether it is a late addition. In it the translator of Marivaux appears to utter sentiments obviously similar to those of "the author of *Clarissa*." It begins:

The reading of that part of history that relates to human life and manners has always been considered by allowed judges as one of the best means of instructing and improving the mind. When we see the heart laid open, and the secret springs and movements that actuate it exposed, and set in one impartial light, with their different good and evil tendencies, we are enabled to form a true estimate of human nature, and are taught what ought or ought not to be our conduct in every similar instance.

Compare with this Richardson's statement in the preface of *Clarissa* that it is a "History of life and manners . . . proposed to carry the force of an example," and his description of the novel on the title-page as a history "comprehending the most important concerns of private life; and particularly showing the distresses that may attend the misconduct both of parents and children in relation to marriage." Likewise compare with what follows in the quotation from the Translator's Preface Richardson's statement in the Postscript to *Clarissa* to the effect that if in a depraved age, devoid of both private and public virtues, "if in an age given up to diversion and entertainment, he could *steal in*, as may be said, and investigate the great doctrines of Christianity under the fashionable guise of an amusement," the author would be throwing in "his mite toward introducing a reformation so much wanted."

The Translator's Preface continues:

But the instruction, I think, is not carried to it's proper extent: the scene of action is generally laid in exalted and publick life; among deep politicians and martial heroes. . . .

But when history is reduced to our own level, and applicable to our real circumstances in life, much extensive and lasting benefit may accrue from the perusal of it; for, in the right discharge of the common duties of humanity, and in a proper conduct, either in affluent or in embarrassed or difficult circumstances, every one has an immediate and important concern; in the frailties too, and little foibles of our nature, we are all pretty equal sharers. An example, therefore, given to these purposes, that describes every different disposition of the mind, according to the variety of it's situations, and the actions naturally flowing from these dispositions; and all guarded, too, with just encomiums on the side of virtue, and severe censures and remonstrances against vice; cannot fail, I think of making a strong impression on the mind of every person not wholly lost to all sense of moral excellence, and producing some of the genuine fruits of it in his conduct.

Besides histories of this kind are generally made publick by way of entertainment; and, under that notion, even a libertine may be induced to read them with eagerness and delight; and, it is highly probable that if he goes through them with attention, and is not past all reflection and serious thought, some instance, or applicable circumstance may strike him, and tend greatly to his reformation. And what an entertainment, indeed, will they be to a sober and judicious reader, when he finds religion and virtue painted in most lovely colours, and set in every attractive light.

This last sentence is so similar in diction and sentiment to the religious discussions both in this translation¹ and in *Letters from Felicia to Charlotte*, as to suggest the probability that this Preface was written either by Mrs. Collyer or by her husband, who outlived her. Equally like Mrs. Collyer's utterances elsewhere is the paragraph on educational ideals, which follows. These discussions in the Preface make very clear the translator's personal interests and her moral intention, which appear in the interpolations and in the conclusions she supplies for Marivaux's more objective original:

The advantage, too, that these entertaining pictures of human nature may be of to youth, is very considerable. Those who have been concerned in the important business of education, must know that the love of pleasure is the most easy inlet to young minds: everything that presents itself through this channel is sure to gain a ready access; close and abstract reasoning are above their capacity; grave and serious discourses may sometimes fail of the intended effect; for (not to insist on the aversion common in young people to everything gloomy and solemn, and that is imposed as a task) it requires great exercise of thought and reflection to attend to the thread of a discourse, and conceive immediately every idea the writer or speaker would express.

¹ See above, p. 171.

But lively examples and plain matters of fact, are easily comprehended; and, the moment their understandings are informed, the affections are excited; which being free from all false biasses, are properly and exactly suited to each particular incident as it occurs to them; and thus if due care is taken to fix the application deeply in their minds, a love of virtue and an abhorrence of vice, is insensibly instilled into them, and the impressions may last for ever.

It must be acknowledged then, that a history in familiar and common life is in point of real usefulness preferable to any other; since the benefits arising from it are universal, and extend to all stations and circumstances; for even the statemen and general (in which two peculiar views mankind are commonly represented in history) cannot be said to form a complete character, without attending to the offices and duties of private life; and it is this last branch of conduct (when this history is related) that can be of real advantage to the generality, and point out anything to them capable of their imitation.

The history before us deserves to be considered as a useful piece of instruction; a lesson of nature; a true and lively picture of the human heart. . . .

As to this translation, I have not much to offer. When I read the original, I thought it would admit of an English dress, that might do justice to the fine spirit that reigns throughout: with this view, and to give my female readers especially a piece worthy of their attention, entire, and in some measure perfect, I immediately set about it. How I have succeeded in my attempt, the publick must determine; and the encouragement it meets with will sufficiently declare their sentiments.

Reference in the last paragraph is apparently to the interpolations and conclusion supplied, which may be conceived of as making for the production of the piece "entire, and in some measure perfect." A less candid justification of these additions appears in a footnote early in the first part:

The Paris edition, and that of the Hague of 1735, have omitted this, and several of the foregoing particulars, but for what reason we cannot imagine.¹

This note may not be the work of the translator herself; in the Preface *I*, not *we*, is used. The date 1735 is of course incorrect; the edition was 1745. This dates the composition of the note as after that year, but not necessarily the rest of the work. I suspect the note of being an addition of much later date by a wary and sophisticated publisher.

¹ *The Virtuous Orphan* (London, 1784), p. 14.

Certain artistic and moralistic attitudes common to this Preface to the Collyer translation of *Marianne* and to some of Richardson's critical statements enforce a point which, while not new, has not, I think, been sufficiently stressed; namely, that to prove specific indebtedness on Richardson's part to the reading of Marivaux's *Marianne* is after all less significant and less possible, perhaps, than to prove that Richardson and Marivaux held similar positions in relation to literary predecessors of similar sort; that both illustrate fictional tendencies growing out of literature of other *genres* immediately preceding them, so that like results, not only in their novels, but in the works of their contemporaries, may spring from like causes of earlier date in England and in France, and not from the influence of a particular Frenchman upon his English contemporary. As indicative, then, of certain widespread influences and tendencies at work in the fiction of the Richardsonian period, the following points may be noted:

1. The Translator's Preface to the Collyer version seems to suggest the relation of *Marianne* to that drama to which I feel Richardson's work is certainly related, that is, to *Domestic Tragedy* and *Sentimental Comedy*,¹ to what Mr. Bernbaum has termed the *Drama of Sensibility*, which immediately preceded both Richardson and Marivaux. This drama Richardson quotes and cites repeatedly in *Pamela* and *Clarissa*² and to this drama, in France, Marivaux contributed.³ This common background, out of which may have emerged similar effects with nothing more than a subconscious connection, I think has not been sufficiently considered. For instance, in the prologue to Rowe's *Fair Penitent* (1705), a domestic tragedy, avowedly admired by Richardson, which perhaps in the character of Lothario provided the prototype for Lovelace, appear the following lines, similar in thought and feeling to the second and third paragraphs just quoted from the Translator's Preface to *Marianne*, and to statements by Richardson quoted later:

¹ The choice of the name *Indiana* seems an echo of Steele's *Conscious Lovers*, in which the heroine of that name is also a child of mystery, identified at the end, and reunited to her family.

² On Richardson's relation to Rowe, especially to his *Fair Penitent*, see H. G. Ward, "Richardson's Character of Lovelace," in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, VII (1912), 494-98.

³ On Marivaux and the sentimental drama see E. Bernbaum, *The Drama of Sensibility* (Boston and London, 1915), pp. 188 ff.

Long has the fate of kings and empires been
 The common business of the tragic scene,
 As if misfortune made the throne her seat,
 And none could be unhappy but the great.

.
 Stories like these with wonder we may hear,
 But far remote and in a higher sphere,
 We ne'er can pity what we ne'er can share.

.
 Therefore an humbler theme our author chose,
 A melancholy tale of private woes:

.
 Who writes shou'd still let nature be his care,
 Mix shades with lights, and not paint all things fair,
 But shew you men and women as they are.

Moreover, just as Richardson and Marivaux may both be shown to be influenced by the *Drama of Sensibility*, just so a common indebtedness may be proved to the periodical essays, particularly to the *Spectator*. Marivaux's debt to the *Spectator* has been clearly set forth in Mr. Baldwin's study, "Marivaux's Place in Character Portrayal."¹ Richardson's familiarity with the *Spectator*, as well as with the *Tatler* and *Guardian* and with other works of Addison and Steele, is indicated by the quotations from his correspondence and from *Pamela* and *Clarissa* collected in Dr. Erich Peotzsche's dissertation.² This common influence Mr. Gosse suggests when he says:

The direct link between Addison as a picturesque narrative essayist and Richardson as the first great English novelist is to be found in Pierre de Marivaux (1688-1763), who imitated the *Spectator*, and who is often assumed, though somewhat too rashly, to have suggested the tone of *Pamela*.³

2. The passages quoted from the Translator's Preface to *Marianne* may be compared in their statement of the author's purpose with a temporary preface to one of Richardson's works—the Preface reprinted by Mr. Macaulay⁴ from the beginning of the fourth volume of the first edition of *Clarissa* (1748), omitted from subsequent editions.

¹ *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXVII (1912), 168-87.

² *Samuel Richardsons Belesenheit* (Kiel, 1908), pp. 6, 46-47.

³ *A History of Eighteenth Century Literature* (London, 1896), p. 243. (Quoted by Baldwin, *op. cit.*, p. 168, note.)

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 465-66.

This Preface is admittedly not by Richardson, but by "a very learned and eminent hand"; therefore I think it hardly deserves the credence Mr. Macaulay accorded it as "a definite statement made on Richardson's own authority that in the writing of *Pamela* he had been following the lead of those French writers who had at length hit upon the true secret" of making fiction improve as well as entertain. I do not believe that in this preface Richardson himself necessarily "acknowledges obligation to the way of writing in which some of the late French writers had greatly excelled," or that he ascribes not to himself but to the French "the discovery of the true secret of fiction."¹ Richardson, I believe, sincerely felt what he expressed in the much quoted letter to Aaron Hill:

I thought the story if written in an easy and natural manner, suitable to the simplicity of it, might possibly introduce a new species of writing, that might possibly turn young people into a course of reading different from the pomp and parade of romance-writing, and dismissing the improbable and marvellous, with which novels generally abound, might tend to promote the cause of religion and virtue.²

But I believe that the more learned and cosmopolitan writer of his temporary preface interpreted in the light of his own wider reading the intention of the provincially minded author, while expressing views not at all unusual to his time. That this Preface was later omitted, that the comparison to French fiction was not incorporated in Richardson's own Preface or Postscript, that his correspondence (so far as it has been published) makes no reference, appreciative or hostile, to this Preface or to the ideas expressed in it, seems to me to indicate that Richardson did not necessarily value highly nor, indeed, suggest or authorize the sentiments involved.

For its similarities at certain points to the Preface to the Collyer translation of *Marianne*—both of them signs of one time, I repeat—this temporary preface is of interest to my purpose. For in this anonymous Preface to *Clarissa*, in Richardson's letter about *Pamela* to Aaron Hill, and in the Translator's Preface to *Marianne*, appear the same desire to purvey instruction in the guise of entertainment, the same emphasis on the portrayal of life and manners by reducing

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 467.

² Dobson, *op. cit.*, p. 26. Compare this with the quotation from the Translator's Preface.

history to the level of the readers. The temporary preface to *Clarissa* reads:

If it may be thought reasonable to criticize the Public Taste, in what are generally supposed to be Works of mere Amusement; or modest to direct its judgment, in what is offered for its Entertainment; I would beg leave to introduce the following Sheets with a few cursory Remarks, that may lead the common Reader into some tolerable conception of the nature of this work, and the design of its Author.

It traces the corruption of public taste and moral standards through the stories of enchantment, the stories of intrigue, and finally through the heroical romances of the French. Then it goes on to say:

At length this great People . . . hit upon the true secret, by which alone a deviation from strict fact, in the commerce of Man, could be really entertaining to an improved mind, or useful to promote that Improvement. And this was by a faithful and chaste copy of real *Life* and *Manners*: In which some of their late Writers have greatly excelled.

It was on this sensible plan, that the Author of the following Sheets attempted to please. . . .

. . . He apprehends that, in the study of Human Nature, the knowledge of those apprehensions leads us farther into the recesses of the Human Mind, than the colder and more general reflections suited to a continued and more contracted Narrative.

This is the nature and purport of his Attempt. Which, perhaps may not be so well or generally understood. For if the Reader seeks here Strange Tales, Love Stories, Heroical Adventures, or, in short, for anything but a *Faithful Picture of Nature in Private Life*, he had better be told before hand the likelihood of his being disappointed. But if he can find Use or Entertainment; either *Directions for his Conduct* or *Employment for his Piety*, in a HISTORY of LIFE and MANNERS, where, as in the world itself, we find Vice, for a time, triumphant, and Virtue in distress, an idle hour or two, we hope, may not be unprofitably lost."¹

Compare with this final paragraph the concluding paragraphs of the Translator's Preface to *Marianne*, and the prologue to Rowe's *The Fair Penitent*, just quoted.

The Translator's Preface to *The Virtuous Orphan; Or, the Life of Marianne* appears to me, then, an interesting piece of literary criticism of the Richardsonian period, indicating a current popular view of Marivaux's novel, and revealing, as do Richardson's prefaces (both those of his own writing and the temporary one just quoted)

¹ Macaulay, *op. cit.*, pp. 465-66.

a well-developed attitude toward fiction of that period, an attitude of which *Pamela* and *Clarissa* were perhaps the full expressions and not the initial inspiration. These documents indicate the deliberate acceptance of the novel as a moral, democratic force, setting forth the popular philosophy of the day—a strange compound of Locke, Shaftesbury, and Hume, devoted to the doctrine of the rewards of innate virtue and the harmony of a divinely created universe.¹

For the student of English fiction, then, what are the conclusions to be drawn from the known facts about the translations of *Marianne*?

1. That before the publication of *Clarissa* at least three translated versions of *Marianne* were at hand. Of the first one (which appeared in parts in 1736, 1737, 1742) the first two volumes, available before the publication of *Pamela*, probably contained only the first six parts of the story. That this translation continued on sale long after the appearance of the second translation is evidenced by its advertisement among "Books Sold by C. Davis. Octavo. Duodecimo.," in the back of Lockman's translation of Marivaux's *Pharsamond* in 1750. The second translation—which I believe to be the work of Mary Collyer—probably appeared first at some time between 1737 and 1743 under the title *The Virtuous Orphan; Or, the Life of Marianne*; and in 1746 under the title *The Life and Adventures of Indiana, the Virtuous Orphan*. Both titles reappear in the later editions, as attested by Bent: the former reappeared in a reprint in Harrison's "Novelists' Magazine" in 1784; the latter was known to Clara Reeve and was described by her in 1785. *The Virtuous Orphan* is vaguely referred to in the periodicals of 1767 and 1768. Apparently, therefore, quite apart from the wide reading it had in French among the more cosmopolitan of the English reading-public, Marivaux's

¹ Miss Schröers points out (*op. cit.*, p. 252) that Marivaux was not without some moralistic intention: "Richardson mit seinem strengen, puritanischen ansichten liess deutlicher als Marivaux die moralische seite seines werkes hervortreten. Aber jene kritiker haben unrecht, die beweisen wollen, das Marivaux in *Marianne* absolut nicht an einen moralischen zweck dachte. Er drückt sich in klaren worten über seine absichten aus: 'Si vous (les lecteurs) regardez *La Vie de Marianne* comme un Roman . . . votre critique est juste; il y a trop de réflexions, et ce n'est pas là la forme ordinaire des Romans, ou des Histoires faites simplement pour divertir. Mais Marianne n'a point songé à faire un Roman non plus' [*La Vie de Marianne* par Marivaux. Avertissement, 2nde partie, tome I^{er}]."

novel must have had an extensive vogue in translated form, since no canny publisher of any time would risk the duplication of current translations unless the demand very obviously justified such an augmentation of the supply.

2. It seems legitimate to argue, quite apart from the question of Richardson's indebtedness to his reading of *Marianne*, that though the germinal idea of *Pamela* originated at an early date in a veritable situation, yet the method of treating it might have been influenced, perhaps even unconsciously to the author, by the current interest in bourgeois psychology which was stimulated by the wide reading of *Marianne*.¹ In similar fashion, Richardson's use of the epistolary method was doubtless the result of the current interest in letter-writing in various forms and the popularity of previous experiments for purposes of fiction by Mrs. Behn, Mrs. Manley, Mrs. Haywood, and others. That Richardson should have felt the backwash from literary currents which he himself had not directly perceived is not incredible. Just as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is not the first but the greatest of a long line of allegories, French and English, several of which resemble it in essential particulars, but to none of which specific indebtedness has been proved, so Richardson's "new species of writing" may well have been the spontaneous result of antecedent conditions unaffected by conscious borrowing or imitation.

HELEN SARD HUGHES

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

¹ As indication of the effect upon even minor fiction of the tone and method of *Marianne* I quote a paragraph from a review of *The History of Cornelia*, a novel attributed to Mrs. Sarah Scott:

"The author of *Cornelia* has distinguished his attempt to gratify the taste of mankind for works of imagination, from most authors, by the graver turn of his performance. In this, as well as several of the incidents he affects an imitation of *Marianne*; but has unfortunately carried his seriousness too far. For the history of *Marianne*, tho' grave, is not stiff; and tho' serious, not formal, but an agreeable vein of freedom and good humor runs through the whole, and sets it at an equal distance from what is loose and trifling on the one hand and dull and pedantic on the other" (*Mon. Rev.*, III [May, 1750], 59)